

REMARKS

The above amended claims and following remarks are submitted in response to the Final Office Action mailed on June 26, 2008. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks and amendments. Claims 1, 14, and 19 are amended. Claims 3, 4, 7-9, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 25-27 and 30 are canceled. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13-15, 18-20, 23, 24, 28, 29 and 31 are pending in the application.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-25, 27-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0096110 filed by Yogeshwar et al. (hereinafter "Yogeshwar") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,110,608 issued to Chan et al. (hereinafter "Chan").

Claim 1, as amended, recites the elements of "a request receiving unit to receive a request from the other image processing apparatus requesting for the image data having the first data compression format," "wherein the first data compression format is a JPEG 2000 format," "wherein the re-compression of the decompressed image data is performed with a lossless compression scheme," "wherein the lossless compression scheme is a JPEG/DPCM scheme," and "wherein the other image processing apparatus is operable to decompress JPEG compressed data but not to decompress JPEG 2000 compressed data." The limitations incorporate the elements in claims 3, 4, 7 and 9. Moreover, support for the amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0046], [0050] and [0105] of the Specification.

Yogeshwar fails to teach these elements. In contrast, Yogeshwar discloses a transcoder module for decoding and encoding archived data. See Yogeshwar, paragraph [0142]. Encoded digital data is then outputted to a delivery system. However, Yogeshwar at least fails to teach or suggest that the delivery system "is operable to decompress JPEG compressed data but not to decompress JPEG 2000 compressed data," as recited in amended claim 1. For example, as disclosed in paragraph [0105] of the Specification:

It is to be noted that the request signal from the client computer 4 includes a compression format that can be decompressed by an application of the client computer 4. Here, in this example, a JPEG/DCT format is employed as the compression format that the client computer 4 is able to decompress by using an application thereof. In other words, **in this particular example, the client computer 4 is unable, or it is otherwise undesirable to**

have the client computer 4, to decompress data that is encoded according to the JPEG 2000 format.

(emphasis added). Instead, Yogeshwar is silent in this aspect with respect to whether the delivery system “is operable to decompress JPEG compressed data but not to decompress JPEG 2000 compressed data,” as recited in amended claim 1. See Yogeshwar, paragraph [0086]. Consequently, for at least these reasons, Yogeshwar fails to teach or suggest the elements of “a request receiving unit to receive a request from the other image processing apparatus requesting for the image data having the first data compression format,” “wherein the first data compression format is a JPEG 2000 format,” “wherein the re-compression of the decompressed image data is performed with a lossless compression scheme,” “wherein the lossless compression scheme is a JPEG/DPCM scheme,” and “wherein the other image processing apparatus is operable to decompress JPEG compressed data but not to decompress JPEG 2000 compressed data,” as recited in amended claim 1.

Moreover, Chan fails to teach or suggest the above cited elements of amended claim 1. Instead, Chan discloses a structure for a JPEG2000 codestream. See Chan, column 11, lines 10-21. Consequently, for at least the reasons set forth above, Yogeshwar in view of Chan fails to teach or suggest each element of amended claim 1. In addition, dependent claims 2, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 13 are patentable over the cited art because each of these claims depends on claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 13 are respectfully requested.

With respect to independent claims 14 and 19, these claims, as amended, recite analogous limitations to those in amended claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with amended claim 1, Yogeshwar in view of Chan fails to teach each element of amended claims 14 and 19. Further, dependent claims 15, 18, 20, 23, 24, 28, 29 and 31 are patentable over the cited art because each of these claims depends on either claim 14 or 19. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 28, 29 and 31 are respectfully requested.

With respect to claims 3, 4, 7, 9, 16, 17, 21, 22, 25 and 27, these claims have been canceled. Thus, the Examiner’s rejection is moot.

Claims 8, 12, 26 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yogeshwar in view of Chan in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0120589 filed by Lopresti et al. (hereinafter “Lopresti”).

In regard to claims 8, 12, 26, and 30, these claims have been canceled. Therefore, the Examiner’s rejection is moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 9/26, 2008


Michael J. Mallie Reg. No. 36,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted online via EFS Web to the Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on September 26, 2008.


Angela M. Quinn

9-26-08
September 26, 2008